



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/564,032

06/12/2006

Noriaki Izumi

4799-010

4011

22429

7590

09/04/2007

LOWE HAUPTMAN HAM & BERNER, LLP

1700 DIAGONAL ROAD

SUITE 300

ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER

HUR, ECE

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2109

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

09/04/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

80

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/564,032	Applicant(s) IZUMI ET AL.	
	Examiner ECE HUR	Art Unit 2109	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 January 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 10 January 2006 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>06/12/2006 and 01/10/2006</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

This action is responsive to application and first IDS filed on January 10, 2006, second IDS filed on June 12, 2006 in which claims 1-24 are presented for examination. This application is a new PCT National Stage application of PCT/JP04/09923 that was filed on December 7, 2004. Applicant is claiming foreign priority for the application 2003-196076 filed on December 7, 2003 in Japan.

Status of Claims

Claims 1-24 are pending in the case. Claims 1 and 13 are independent claims.

Claim 12 is rejected under U.S.C. 101.

Claims 1-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Information Disclosure Statement Acknowledgement

The information disclosure statements filed on January 10, 2006 and on June 12, 2006 are in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97, 1.98 and MPEP § 609. It has been placed in the application file, the information referred to therein has been considered as to the merits.

Abstract Objection

The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because there are spelling errors for example paste is spelled as "past". Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Drawings Objection

The drawings are objected to because there are spelling errors for example in FIG. 25 information is spelled as "informaiton" and source is spelled as "soruce". Furthermore in FIG. 36 distance is spelled as "distanç". Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d), or amendment to the specification to add the reference character(s) in the description in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(b) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Specification Objection

The lengthy specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter, specifically directed towards Software per se.

Regarding Claim 12, Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter and claiming "Software" per se. Software is functional descriptive material that can be considered statutory only if it is both functional and clearly embodied on a computer readable medium and designed to support specific data manipulation function. When functional descriptive material is recorded on a computer-readable medium it will become structurally and functionally interrelated the medium and will be statutory in most cases since the use of technology permits the function of the descriptive material to be realized. See *In re Lowry*, 32 F.3D 1579, 32 USPQ2d 1031, 1035 (Fed. Cir 1994) and *Warmerdam*, 33 F.3d at 1360-61, 31 USPQd at 1759. A Software structure is functional if the specific arrangement of data enables a computer to accomplish useful result arising from the arrangement of the data in the software. However, only computer readable medium executed instruction by a processor could be statutory, it is not clearly defined as being embodied in a computer readable medium as executed

Art Unit: 2109

instruction and is therefore not statutory. See Warmerdam, 33 F.3d at 1360, 31 USPQ2d at 1759.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ed Bott, Using Microsoft Office 2000, 1999 by Que, pages 349-351 and 380-382, in view of Rawat, US 6,662,340.

Regarding Claim 1, Ed Bott discloses the claimed aspect of a method of information processing comprising copying plural objects and pasting the plural objects to the paste targets, wherein in Excel object(s) in a cell or in multiple cells could be copied pasted. (Bott, Page 348, first section of Moving and Copying).

Ed Bott does not teach the aspect of performing a semantic analysis and selecting paste targets which match with results of the semantic analysis.

However, Rawat discloses the claimed aspect of performing a semantic analysis on each of the plural objects in FIG. 3 and FIG. 4, wherein the values are matched with the dictionaries previously described to map the fields to

Art Unit: 2109

metadata, wherein metadata comprises a data type, such as Last name, First name, AddressLine 1, AddressLine 2 and City. (Rawat, Page 6, Paragraph 5, lines 3-9). Furthermore, Rawat discloses the claimed aspect of performing semantic analysis by analyzing text expressions that occur within a predetermined number of words and within predetermined direction and distances from the field and based on page coordinates, examining the general vicinity of the form in all directions from the field and analyzing the text expression closest to the field and ignoring supplemental text that does not contribute to the field label while searching for the field label, for example, text within parentheses or quotation marks. (Rawat, Page 6, Paragraph 45, lines 1-9). Applicant should duly note that of one ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have other metadata classifications according to the setting and the functional requirements. Furthermore, Rawat discloses in FIG. 3 and FIG. 4 Label Dictionary, Normalization Dictionary and Display Dictionary.

The motivation to combine Bott's copy and paste method with Rawat's dictionary semantics technique to determine the attributes of the fields would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention because relating information based on predefined rules would prevent repeatedly switching between the source and display. More specifically the motivation to combine would be to relate information to a particular area or person and this could be achieved by predefined rules such as using semantics. Applicant should duly note that it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of

Art Unit: 2109

the invention to select paste targets which match with results of the semantic analysis.

Regarding Claim 2, most of the limitations have been met in the rejection of Claim 1. See the rejection of Claim 1 for details. Ed Bott discloses the claimed aspect of copying the plural objects from a copy module according to a copy instruction of a user, wherein in FIGURE 17.6 by holding down the right mouse button when you drag a selection from one place to another, there are the following options such as "Copy Here as Values Only" or "Copy Here as Formats Only" are provided to the user. (Bott, Page 349).

Ed Bott discloses the claimed aspect of selecting includes selecting the paste target from a paste module according to a paste instruction of the user, wherein Paste Special allows users to choose how to transfer information stored. (Bott, Page 348).

Regarding Claim 3, most of the limitations have been met in the rejection of Claim 2. See the rejection of Claim 2 for details. Ed Bott discloses the claimed aspect of copying includes issuing the copy instruction by one user operation, and the selecting includes issuing the paste instruction by one user operation, wherein copy and paste operations are performed with one user operation such as selecting "Copy Here as Values Only" and "Paste Special".

Regarding Claim 4, most of the limitations have been met in the rejection of Claim 2. See the rejection of Claim 2 for details. Rawat discloses the claimed

Art Unit: 2109

aspect of performing semantic analysis by analyzing text expressions that occur within a predetermined number of words and within predetermined direction and distances from the field and based on page coordinates, examining the general vicinity of the form in all directions from the field and analyzing the text expression closest to the field and ignoring supplemental text that does not contribute to the field label while searching for the field label, for example, text within parentheses or quotation marks. (Rawat, Page 6, Paragraph 45, lines 1-9). Applicant should duly note that semantic analysis could be based on distance for example having a cursor at certain location and highlighting a certain area for a given radius is obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention.

Regarding Claim 5, most of the limitations have been met in the rejection of Claim 4. See the rejection of Claim 4 for details. Bott achieves the claimed aspect of copying includes copying plural objects with a structural association from the copy module based on the copy instruction in FIG. 17.6, wherein by holding down the right mouse button when you drag a selection from one place to another, there are the following options such as "Copy Here as Values Only" or " Copy Here as Formats Only" are provided to the user. (Bott, Page 349).

Furthermore Bott discloses the claimed achieves the claimed aspect of selecting the paste target with a structural association from the paste module based on the paste instruction in FIGURE 17.7, wherein Paste Special menu has the following options such as "All, Formulas, Values, Formats". (Bott, Page 351).

Regarding Claim 6, most of the limitations have been met in the rejection of Claim 2. See the rejection of Claim 2 for details. Bott discloses the achieved aspect of copying and pasting the plural objects in a predetermined range from the copy module based on the copy instruction, wherein a cell or a contiguous range is selected to move or copy. (Bott, Page 349, 350).

Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ed Bott, Using Microsoft Office 2000 in view of Nguyen, US 5,544,302.

Regarding Claim 1, Ed Bott discloses the claimed aspect of a method of information processing comprising copying plural objects and pasting the plural objects to the paste targets, wherein in Excel object(s) in a cell or in multiple cells could be copied pasted. (Bott, Page 348, first section of Moving and Copying).

Ed Bott does not teach the aspect of performing a semantic analysis and selecting paste targets which match with results of the semantic analysis.

However, Nguyen discloses the claimed aspect of performing a semantic analysis on each of the plural objects in FIG.22, wherein the catalog uses the dictionary semantics which user preference MPreferenceCollection objects provide. (Nguyen, Page 20, Paragraph 5, lines 5-7).

The motivation to combine Bott's copy and paste method with Nguyen's dictionary semantics technique to determine the attributes of the fields, because

Art Unit: 2109

the motivation to combine would be to relate information to a particular area or person and this could be achieved by predefined rules such as using semantics. Applicant should duly note that it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to select paste targets which match with results of the semantic analysis.

Regarding Claim 2, most of the limitations have been met in the rejection of Claim 1. See the rejection of Claim 1 for details. Ed Bott discloses the claimed aspect of copying the plural objects from a copy module according to a copy instruction of a user, wherein in FIGURE 17.6 by holding down the right mouse button when you drag a selection from one place to another, there are the following options such as "Copy Here as Values Only" or "Copy Here as Formats Only" are provided to the user. (Bott, Page 349).

Ed Bott discloses the claimed aspect of selecting includes selecting the paste target from a paste module according to a paste instruction of the user, wherein Paste Special allows users to choose how to transfer information stored. (Bott, Page 348).

Regarding Claim 3, most of the limitations have been met in the rejection of Claim 2. See the rejection of Claim 2 for details. Ed Bott discloses the claimed aspect of copying includes issuing the copy instruction by one user operation, and the selecting includes issuing the paste instruction by one user operation,

Art Unit: 2109

wherein copy and paste operations are performed with one user operation such as selecting "Copy Here as Values Only" and "Paste Special".

Claims 7-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ed Bott, Using Microsoft Office 2000 in view of Rawat, US 6,662,340 and in further view of James, US 7,036,080 B1.

Regarding Claims 7 and 8, most of the limitations have been met in the rejection of Claim 2. See the rejection of Claim 2 for details. Neither Bott nor Rawat teach the aspect of voice instruction. However, James discloses a method and apparatus for providing speech control to a graphical user interface (GUI), wherein audio input is used as instruction. (James, See Abstract).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Bott's copy and paste features with James's voice instruction because, it will allow mobile users with inadequately-sized keyboards and pointing devices to give voice instruction. Furthermore, typically, GUIs are mouse- and keyboard-intensive, which can be problematic or even impossible to use for many people, including those with physical disabilities. A speech interface allows audio input of commands to communicate with applications, and can be used by anyone who wishes to speak to their system. (James, Page 1, Paragraphs 15-20, lines 1-10).

Claims 9-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ed Bott, Using Microsoft Office 2000 in view of Rawat, US 6,662,340 and in further view of Bauchot, US 20020007380.

Regarding Claims 9 and 10, most of the limitations have been met in the rejection of Claim 2. See the rejection of Claim 2 for details. Neither Bott nor Rawat teach the aspect of user acceptance. However, Bauchot discloses the claimed aspect of user acceptance in US 20020007380, in FIG. 7A, 703, wherein retrieving user's choice is illustrated.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Bott's copy and paste features with Bauchot's user acceptance feature because, it will allow users to apply copy and paste function more efficiently. Applicant should duly note that user acceptance and user's choice is commonly applied in computer applications at the time of the invention.

Claims 11-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ed Bott, Using Microsoft Office 2000 in view of Rawat, US 6,662,340 and in further view of Terasawa, JP 05298003.

Regarding Claim 11, most of the limitations have been met in the rejection of Claim 2. See the rejection of Claim 2 for details. Neither Bott nor Rawat teach the aspect of copy instruction and the paste instruction that are provided by an instruction device which has a communication function between the copy module

and the paste module explicitly. However, Terasawa discloses the claimed aspect of copy instruction and the paste instruction are provided by an instruction device which has a communication function between the copy module and the paste module in JP 405298003A, in 1993, a "Data processing device", which is a technique for having a plurality of paste buffers, in each of which data in the source screen data is stored. Terasawa discloses the claimed aspect of information processing comprising copying plural objects and pasting the plural objects to the paste targets and this allows users to avoid repeatedly switching between displaying the source screen and the editing target screen, and irrespective of the relation between the individual items in the plurality of data, the desired data is once copied to the plurality of paste buffers and then the destination of each buffer data is assigned one by one. (Hara, US 20070074133, Page 1, Paragraph 0003).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Bott's copy and paste features with Terasawa's Data processing device because this will allow users to make copy multiple objects.

Regarding Claim 12, most of the limitations have been met in the rejection of Claim 1. See the rejection of Claim 1 for details. Ed Bott achieves the claimed aspect of a computer program product of information processing for making a computer execute the method of information processing according to claim 1, wherein the product is Microsoft Office 2000.

Art Unit: 2109

Claims 13-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ed Bott, Using Microsoft Office 2000, 1999 by Que, pages 349-351 and 380-382, in view of Rawat, US 6,662,340.

Claims 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ed Bott, Using Microsoft Office 2000 in view of Rawat, US 6,662,340 and in further view of James, US 7,036,080 B1.

Claims 21-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ed Bott, Using Microsoft Office 2000 in view of Rawat, US 6,662,340 and in further view of Bauchot, US 20020007380.

Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ed Bott, Using Microsoft Office 2000 in view of Rawat, US 6,662,340 and in further view of Terasawa, JP 05298003.

Regarding Claims 13-23, Terasawa discloses the claimed aspect of processing apparatus in JP 405298003A, in 1993, wherein a "Data processing device", is introduced. The method claimed in Claims 1-11 could applied on Terasawa's data processing device. Claim rejections 1-11 applies to Claims 13-23.

Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ed Bott, Using Microsoft Office 2000, 1999 by Que, pages 349-351 and 380-382, in view of Rawat, US 6,662,340 and in further view with Takatsuka, US 20020156615 A1.

Regarding Claim 24, most of the limitations have been met in the rejection of Claim 1. See the rejection of Claim 1. Neither Bott nor Rawat teach the aspect of remote controller. However, Takatsuka discloses the claimed aspect of a remote controller which executes the method of information processing in FIG. 1, wherein a remote controller is displayed as an information entry device.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Bott's copy and paste features with Takatsuka's remote controller device because this will allow users rapid information entry.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- 1) Bauchot, Frederic et al., US 20010032214 A1, 10/18/2001, "Method and system in an electronic spreadsheet for handling absolute references in a copy/cut and paste operation according to different modes".
- 2) Hobson, et al., US 6,370,259 , 04/09/2002, "Automatic address extractor".
- 3) Broman, Paul et al., US 20050149871 A1, 07//07/2005, "Automated document formatting tool".

Art Unit: 2109

- 4) Omoigui, Nosa, US 20030126136, 07/03/2003, "System and method for knowledge retrieval, management, delivery and presentation".
- 5) Walker, Kenneth A. JR., US 20040153974, 08/05/2004, "Markup language store-and-paste".
- 6) Broman, Paul, et al., US 20030004957, 01/02/2003, "Automated document formatting tool".
- 7) Hara, Masao, et al. US 20070074133 A1, "Method, Device, and Computer Program Product for Copying and Pasting A Plurality of Data Items as a Group".

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ECE HUR whose telephone number is (571) 270-1972. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thurs 7:30am-5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Frantz Coby can be reached on 571-272-4017. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-

Art Unit: 2109

free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service

Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-

9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

August 22, 2007

Ece Hur
E.H. /e.h.


FRANTZ COBY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER